

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the instant application is respectfully requested. The present submission in conjunction with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and is responsive to the final Office Action of July 9, 2008, in which claims 1-8 are presently pending. Of those, claims 1-6, and 8 remain been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,442,752 to Jennings, et al., in view of U.S. Patent 6,295,642 to Blandy. In addition, claim 7 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jennings in view of Blandy, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,735,598 to Srivastava, et al. For the following reasons, however, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103:

The Applicants have reviewed the Examiner's "Response to Arguments" beginning on page 2 of the final Office Action, and observe the following portions of statements of the Examiner as to why Applicants' arguments in the amendment of March 7, 2008 were deemed not to be persuasive:

"In response to applicant's argument, '**provide versioning of functions with identical signatures**' is not disclosed in the current claim 1..." (final OA, page 3)

"'Jennings' is also producing a DLL in support of subsequent releases of a given product.... 'A first dynamic link library (DLL) of a first computing environment, which exports one or more procedures that an application program executing in the first computing environment can call... The exported procedures of the second DLL have interfaces that are identical (from the perspective of the calling application) to the interfaces of the corresponding exported procedures of the first DLL.' ... the second DLL is considered as a different version from the first DLL." (final OA, page 3)

“In response to applicant's argument, current claim 1 recites ‘wherein said single executable file is configured to facilitate choice of a selected version of said function’ – the current claim also compiles ONE version with subset of code currently required (based on one of variations, characteristics and parameters for each said attribute) and produces only ONE DLL at a time...” (final OA, page 4)

Based on the Applicants’ understanding of the basis for the Examiner’s rejections, although Jennings clearly discloses that subsequent releases (i.e., “versions”) of a given product are produced in separate DLLs, claim 1 as previously amended (according to the Examiner) did not distinguish over the same because the previous claim language recited compiling only one version of code and producing only one DLL at a time.

Although the Applicants do not concede this represents a proper interpretation of the language of claim 1 as previously amended, claim 1 is nonetheless amended in the present response to more clearly point out that with respect to a specific computer program function, each iterative compilation of that function results in a corresponding object file having that same specific program function, but with different attributes with respect to one another. The plurality of object files iteratively compiled (having the same function, but different attributes) are then linked into a single executable DLL. Therefore, the single executable file is configured to facilitate choice of a selected version of the specific computer function.

Therefore, because Jennings clearly teaches that different versions of the same function or application reside in separate DLLs, any combination of the teaching of Jennings and Blandy by one skilled in the art would not result in each element of the claims as presently amended. As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that the §103 rejections have been addressed and overcome.

For the above stated reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. No new matter has been entered and no additional fees are believed to be required. However, if any fees are due with respect to this Amendment, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 09-0463 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,
ANUJA DEEDWANIYA, ET AL.

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicants' Attorneys

By /Sean F. Sullivan/
Sean F. Sullivan
Registration No. 38,328
Customer No. 46429

Date: October 9, 2008
Address: 20 Church Street, 22nd Floor, Hartford, CT 06103
Telephone: (860) 286-2929